

DOCKET NO. 02-IND-139
SERIAL NO. 10/768,962
PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 18, and 20 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, and 17 intermix the terms "source" and "signal line." (*Office Action, Page 2, Section 2, Second paragraph*).

The Applicants have amended the claims as shown above. The Applicants' specification shows that a "charge redistribution circuit" is coupled along a single "signal line." In other words, a first portion of the signal line is coupled to one side of the charge redistribution circuit, and a second portion of the signal line is coupled to another side of the charge redistribution circuit. The Applicants believe that these amendments clarify the claims and resolve the ambiguity noted in the Office Action.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

DOCKET NO. 02-IND-139
SERIAL NO. 10/768,962
PATENT

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,574,633 to Prater ("*Prater*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

Claims 1, 7, and 13 recite that a "second portion" of a signal line is isolated from a "first portion" of the signal line and a "source" coupled to the first portion of the signal line. Claims 1, 7, and 13 also recite that the "second portion" of the signal line is connected to an "intermediate floating virtual source/sink."

The Office Action relies on elements n12 of *Prater* as anticipating the "signal lines" recited in the claims. (*Office Action*, Page 3, Section 4). The elements n12 of *Prater* could be viewed in one of two ways. The elements n12 of *Prater* either (i) represent continuous lines that are not separated into sections, or (ii) represent lines separated into sections by elements n30.

In the first case, the elements n12 of *Prater* are continuous lines not divided into sections. In this case, *Prater* cannot anticipate isolating a "second portion" of a signal line from a "first portion" of the signal line as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. *Prater* also cannot anticipate

DOCKET NO. 02-IND-139
SERIAL NO. 10/768,962
PATENT

connecting the "second portion" of the signal line to an "intermediate floating virtual source/sink" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13.

In the second case, the elements n30 of *Prater* divide the lines n12 into sections. In this case, the elements n30 may separate the portions of the lines n12 on their left from the portions of the lines n12 on their right. However, the elements n30 would not connect part of the lines n12 to an "intermediate floating virtual source/sink" (which the Office Action asserts is anticipated by element 36 in *Prater*). Rather, the portions of the lines n12 to the left of the elements n30 are coupled directly to element 36. As a result, the elements n30 of *Prater* do not anticipate both isolating a "second portion" of a signal line from a "first portion" of the signal line and connecting the "second portion" of the signal line to an "intermediate floating virtual source/sink" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13.

For these reasons, *Prater* fails to anticipate the Applicants' invention as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and full allowance of Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-20.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request full allowance of the claims.

DOCKET NO. 02-IND-139
SERIAL NO. 10/768,962
PATENT

SUMMARY

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at wmunck@davismunck.com.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: _____

July 25, 2005

William A. Munck

William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: wmunck@davismunck.com